

PATENT

Attorney Docket No.: 90204-750840;  
Client Ref. No.: REG00035 1999PT

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of: Jeffrey Bezos	Confirmation No. 8505
Application No.: 09/437,815	Examiner: UBER, NATHAN C
Filed: Nov 10, 1999	Technology Center/Art Unit: 3622
For: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR ALLOCATING DISPLAY SPACE	<u>INFORMAL AGENDA</u>
Customer No. 20350	

Dear Examiner Uber

Please find the Agenda regarding the office action mailed March 21, 2012, to be discussed on May 11, 2012 at 1pm EST by calling 571-270-3923. This agenda will be faxed to 571-270-4923, per your request.

We would like to work together to achieve compact prosecution, and therefore any proposals or suggestions that you may have that would result in allowance or overcome the present rejection would be appreciated, as the goal of the interview is to efficiently achieve compact prosecution.

If you encounter any problems, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-4741 direct or at 925-472-5000 for reception.

Kind regards,

/Ben Holt/  
Ben Holt  
Reg. No. 67,536  
\*Not Admitted in California

Appl. No. 09/437,815  
Agenda dated May 10, 2012  
RE: Office Action of March 21, 2012

PATENT

### **Independent Claim 1**

We would like to discuss the appeal p. 7 (lines 21-24) and p. 8 (lines 1-3) and potential amendments relating to the board's decision.

### **Independent Claim 45**

We would also like to discuss "Minimize Bid" (e.g. Roth col. 8 lines 32-40).

### **Dependent Claim 50**

We would like to discuss how the "amount bid will be increased" (e.g. Roth col. 8, lines 37-39).

### **Dependent Claims 76 and 92**

It appears that the Office Action suggests on p. 10 and 12 that an advertisement is both the advertisement in Walker and the product in Walker. However, that would be inconsistent in Walker.

### **Dependent Claim 78**

The Office Action on p. 13 fails to identify how Carlton-Foss dynamically generates a normalized bid amount.

### **Dependent Claims 79, 94-96, 102, 104,**

It appears that an Old Combination rejection is no longer valid under MPEP 2173.05(j)

jG

64243238 v1